



January 25, 2006

Brother Michael J. McGinniss, FSC, Ph.D.
President
La Salle University
1900 West Olney Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19141-1199

Federal Express Mail
7926-4059-1877

OPE ID: 00328700
PRCN: 200530324635

Dear President McGinniss:


Beginning May 17 and continuing until August 26, 2005, Mr. James Moore and Mr. Donald Tatum, Senior Institutional Review Specialists, conducted a program review focusing on La Salle University's (La Salle; the University) compliance with The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act; the Act). The findings of the review are presented in the enclosed report.

Our review disclosed several weaknesses in the University's campus security operations in general and its approach to the Act in particular. This program review report contains specific findings of non-compliance. These findings are referenced to the applicable Federal laws and regulations. Please review and provide a substantive response to each finding. The University's response must state with particularity the causes for the finding, and describe any steps already taken by the University to correct these findings. Your response should be sent directly to this office, to the attention of Mr. James Moore within 75 days of the date of this letter.

The Department will review the University's response to this draft report and issue a final report. The final report will explain what actions the University must take to comply with the Clery Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended. In addition, the Department will review the University's response to determine if any sanctions are appropriate. If the Department determines that

Philadelphia Team
The Wanamaker Building | 100 Penn Square East | Suite 511 | Philadelphia, PA 19107
(215) 656-6442 Main | (215) 656-6499 Fax

www.federalstudentaid.ed.gov
1-800-4-FED-AID

FEDERAL STUDENT AID  START HERE. GO FURTHER.

Br. Michael J. McGinniss, FSC, Ph.D., President
La Salle University
Campus Security Program Review Report - Page 2

sanctions are appropriate, it will provide the University with a separate notice and opportunity to appeal.

I would like to express my appreciation for the courtesy and cooperation extended during our site visit. If you have any questions regarding this report, please call the Philadelphia School Participation Team at (215) 656-6442. Your continued cooperation throughout the program review process is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "John S. Loreng". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping "J" and "L".

John S. Loreng
Team Leader

Enclosure

cc: Ms. Rose Lee Pauline, Asst. VP, Business Affairs and Affirmative Action
Mr. Joseph J. Cicala, Ph.D., Dean of Students
Mr. Arthur Grover, Director of Public Safety
Mr. Allan B. Wendell, Assoc. Dean of Students
Mr. Mark Badstubner, Asst. Director/ Community Development
Ms. Cindy Davis, Manager, Program Review, PHEAA
Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools - CHE

**Institutional Review Data Sheet
La Salle University**

Date of Review: May 17-August 26, 2005

Years Reviewed: 2001, 2002, and 2003

OPE-ID Number: 00328700

TIN: 231352654

Type and Control: Private, Non-Profit

Accreditation: Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools
- Commission on Higher Education

Reviewing ED Officials: James Moore
Donald Tantum

Title IV Funding (Total): \$31,530,149 (2003-2004 Award Year)

Selected Institutional Officials Contacted/Interviewed:

Br. Michael J. McGinniss, FSC, Ph.D., President
Ms. Rose Lee Pauline, Asst. VP, Business Affairs and Affirmative Action Mr. Joseph J.
Cicala, Ph.D., Dean of Students
Mr. Arthur Grover, Director of Public Safety
Mr. Anthony Morinelli, Investigations, Department of Public Safety
Mr. Franklin Wiedmann Patrol Manager
Mr. Allan B. Wendell, Assoc. Dean of Students
Mr. Mark Badstubner, Asst. Director/ Community Development
Mr. David Fleming, VP, Business Affairs and Treasurer

INTRODUCTION

A. THE UNIVERSITY

Founded in 1863 by the Christian Brothers teaching order established by St. John Baptist de La Salle, La Salle is a private, non-profit postsecondary institution. Currently, La Salle enrolls approximately 6,221 students from 37 states and 42 foreign countries. The University is organized into three schools (Arts and Sciences, Business, and Nursing) offering 47 undergraduate majors. Situated on 100 acres in North Philadelphia, the main campus is comprised of 54 buildings.

B. SCOPE OF REVIEW

A program review was conducted between May 17, 2005 and August 26, 2005. The purpose of the program review was to examine the institution's compliance with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security and Campus Crime Statistics Act (the Clery Act), set forth at §485(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (the HEA). Specifically, the objective was to determine the accuracy and completeness of campus crime statistics reported under the Clery Act for selected incident categories and La Salle's compliance with policy disclosure requirements in calendar years 2001, 2002, and 2003 as published in the University's Campus Security Reports. The program review team examined the institution's records related to campus security including incident reports maintained by the Office of Security and Safety and the Office of Community Development/Student Affairs, which also includes the Office of Residence Life. In addition, a significant amount of documentation was requested and reviewed from many other functional areas including the athletic department, business office, counseling department, real estate office, and various student organizations.

Approximately 10,000 campus security incident reports were provided for our review. These included hard copy incident reports, which were generated for many reasons other than to document criminal activity (e.g., maintenance issues.) In addition, the Student Affairs Office provided information regarding approximately 3,000 campus judicial actions initiated during the review period; hardcopy reports of these actions were requested on a sample basis and for specific types of violations.

We were advised that the Office of Security and Safety and the Office of Community Development/Student Affairs would be the primary source for substantially all records and information. The University indicated that no other security, investigative, or judicial activities were or are performed by any other University office or official. Therefore, even though the University contracts with a private security company to provide additional routine patrol support and for special events, and that company utilizes La Salle incident reports and submits them to the Department of Security and Safety, we did not request any information or records from the contractor. However, certain summary data regarding crime in the 14th and 35th Philadelphia police district were requested and reviewed (See Appendix A).

In addition, we relied on information from approximately 27 interviews of mostly current or former University employees. These interviews helped the case team obtain a more complete picture of institutional policies and practices related to campus security and Clery compliance.

During the review, several areas of non-compliance were identified. Once the University's response to this report is received, we will issue final determinations on any violations of applicable laws.

Although the review was thorough, it cannot be assumed to be all-inclusive. The absence of statements in this report regarding the University's specific practices and procedures must not be construed as acceptance, approval, or endorsement of those specific practices and procedures. Furthermore, nothing in this report shall relieve the University of its obligation to comply with all statutory and regulatory provisions governing the Title IV Programs.

C. FINDINGS AND REQUIREMENTS

FINDING # 1: FAILURE TO REPORT AND MISCODING OF SPECIFIC INCIDENTS

The University failed to report all required incidents in its Campus Security Reports for the years under review, 2001, 2002 and 2003.

Category	Reported	Required	Percentage
2001			
2001 Forcible Sexual Offense	0	2	
2001 Aggravated Assault	3	5	
2001 Burglary	17	37	
2001 Robbery	8	8	
2001 Motor Vehicle Theft	14	12	
2001 Arson	0	0	
2002			
2002 Forcible Sexual Offense	4	3	
2002 Aggravated Assault	1	5	
2002 Burglary	7	12	
2002 Robbery	12	10	
2003			
2003 Aggravated Assault	7	N/A	
2003 Burglary	16	N/A	
2003 Robbery	16	N/A	

The first column in the chart lists the data originally reported by La Salle on its Campus Security Reports. The second column reflects the revised data calculated by La Salle after an audit conducted under the supervision of La Salle's legal counsel and their consultant. The third column shows the percentage of change on the yearly totals from the original data reported by La Salle to the most recent data calculated.

The record keeping systems used by the Offices of Security and Safety and Community Development/Student Affairs makes it difficult to determine which incidents were used to arrive at the statistics in certain Clery categories and which incidents were omitted. This information is necessary to properly identify unreported and under-reported incidents.

An unreported incident is an incident that is reported to a campus security authority but is not documented and captured in the statistics. An under-reported incident is usually from a miscoding of the incident, which is also a violation.

The factors contributing to the reporting violations outlined above include:

- Poorly Written and/or Incomplete Incident Reports;
- No Systematic Compilation or Maintenance of Incident Reports and other records;
- Inclusion of Categories of Crime, such as Larcenies, not Required by the Act;
- Security Staff not Properly Trained;
- Lack of Proper Administrative Oversight;
- Improper coding of incidents resulting in inaccurate numbers for certain crime categories; and
- Failure to coordinate information from all sources.

REFERENCE:

Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act,
20 USC § 1092 (f), as amended, Section 485 (f), Higher Education Act, as amended
34 CFR § 668.46(b)-(c), General Provision Regulations
Appendix E to Part 668 – Crime Definitions in Accordance With the Federal Bureau of
Investigation's Uniform Crime Reporting Program

REQUIREMENT:

Federal regulations at 34 CFR §668.46 (c)(1) require that participating institutions compile and publish for the three most recent calendar years accurate and complete campus crime statistics to inform current and prospective students and employees of important safety and security information. This Campus Security Report must include incidents of: homicide, sex offenses, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft, and arson. This report must also include a statistical disclosure of arrests and disciplinary actions related to violation of Federal or state drug, liquor, and weapons laws. The institution's policies and procedures are required to be published and distributed to all current students and employees and made available to prospective students and employees. To comply with these requirements, all incidents of crime on campus reported to a campus security authority or law enforcement official must be included

in the Campus Security Report and be properly coded according to the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Systems definitions.

In our Final Program Review Determination letter, this office will advise the University of actions that may be required as a result of this violation.

FINDING #2: MISREPRESENTATION OF DISCIPLINARY REFERRAL STATISTICS

Disciplinary referral statistics were materially misrepresented in La Salle's Campus Security Reports due to the omission of Judicial Board referral data. According to La Salle's Lead Security Investigator, the only sources for statistics are incident reports from the Office of Security and Safety and the Community Development/Student Affairs Office. However, many other University offices and officials (such as employees in the Office of Resident Life) receive information that should be included in La Salle's Campus Security Report.

There were inadequate procedures for communication and coordination between the Office of Security and Safety and the Office of Community Development/Student Affairs during the review period. The weaknesses identified include the following:

- There was no standardized protocol for advising Security of incidents occurring in resident halls. Resident life staff were left to determine if Security involvement was needed on an ad hoc basis.
- There was significant lag time between the generation of a Community Development - Student Affairs incident report and the delivery of that report to the Department of Security. A delay of 30 days or more was standard during the review period.
- The relevant offices had no standardized report writing, coding, or control numbering systems in place during the review period. As a result, numerous accounts of the same event were frequently generated that could not be easily cross-referenced or otherwise linked to prevent contradictory accounts and duplicate counting of the same incidents. Our review disclosed that Security generally relied on Uniform Crime Reporting criteria while Community Development/Student Affairs relied on the standards in their conduct code.

Therefore, the University failed to compile and publish accurate and complete statistics regarding persons referred to the campus judicial system as a result of violations of Federal and State laws and University policies. The following chart illustrates reporting errors identified by comparing the University's referral statistics to a sample of incident reports and judicial files that resulted in or should have resulted in a disciplinary response based on available information:

	La Salle Originally Reported	La Salle Revised Statistics	Department of Education Determination	La Salle Originally Reported	La Salle Revised Statistics	Department of Education Determination
2002	19	29	101	9	5	15
2003	0	1	95	1	2	4
2004	0	N/A	91	3	N/A	16

The chart illustrates reporting errors identified by comparing La Salle's initial and revised statistics to samples reviewed by the Department consisting of incident reports and disciplinary files that resulted in or should have resulted in disciplinary measures.

In response to the high volume of cases heard by judicial boards at postsecondary institutions, the 1998 Amendments to the Higher Education Act added judicial referrals as a required reporting category. La Salle's Community Development/Student Affairs Office adjudicates approximately 1,000 such cases each academic year. For example, in the 2002-03 academic year, 1,001 such cases involving 1,096 separate incidents were handled through the disciplinary process. Violations of the University's alcohol policies usually account for more than half of all violations each year. No disciplinary referrals for liquor law violations were disclosed for calendar year 2002 in the original version of the Campus Security Report. Please see Appendix B for more information regarding the number of disciplinary cases at La Salle.

REFERENCE:

Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act,
20 USC § 1092(f), as amended,
Section 485 (f), Higher Education Act, as amended,
34 CFR § 668.46(c)(9), General Provision Regulations

REQUIREMENT:

As previously stated, Federal regulations at 34 CFR §668.46 (c)(1) require that participating institutions compile and publish accurate and complete campus crime statistics. To comply with these requirements, it is essential that institutions have established open lines of communication and appropriate mechanisms to coordinate information and statistics from all appropriate internal and external sources.

In our Final Program Review Determination Letter, this office will advise the University of actions that may be required as a result of this violation.

**FINDING # 3: FAILURE TO PROVIDE TIMELY WARNINGS OR TO MAINTAIN
OPEN CRIME LOGS**

For the years under review, the University did not issue timely warnings regarding serious or on-going threats to the safety and security of the campus community.

Two incidents of alleged sexual assault during 2003 and 2004 are examples of this violation in that timely warnings to the campus community would have been appropriate but were not provided.

- In April 2003, a female student enrolled at La Salle reported to one or two basketball coaches that she had awakened in her room to find a male student sexually assaulting her. However, the staff of La Salle's athletic department did not report the incident to appropriate officials, and thus no warnings were issued.
- In mid-2004, a second female employed by La Salle as a summer basketball camp counselor reported to a basketball coach that she was sexually assaulted while she was under the influence of alcohol on La Salle's grounds by two members of the men's basketball team. The staff members of La Salle's athletic department did not report the incident to appropriate officials and thus no warnings were issued.

Copies were requested of all warnings prepared and distributed to University students and employees during the review period based on this requirement. The documentation demonstrated that many serious incidents reported to campus security authorities, including those involving major crimes against persons and property, did not result in a required warning. Moreover, many of the warnings submitted for review were in the form of "Crime Bulletins" that were distributed solely to security officers during roll call as opposed to campus-wide announcements as required by the Clery Act. The institution's incident reports detailed serious crimes against persons and property including assaults, burglaries, robberies, and indecent exposures. In many cases, there were offenses reported involving multiple victims in a single geographical area or during a particular time period that would also require a warning to be distributed. Announcements to be aware of such offenses and guidance on what to do if confronted with these types of offenders are required.

Through our analysis of Campus Security Reports and interviews, we also determined that the University does not have an adequate policy on the issuance of these warnings as required by the Act. The decision to issue a warning is made by a small group of senior officials including, but not limited to, the Dean of Students, the Director of Communications, and the Director of Security and Safety. This ad hoc group meets on an as-needed basis. However, it is not entirely clear what factors are considered or what drives the decision-making process. All recent versions of the University's Campus Security Reports includes the following language,

"In instances when crimes occur that may endanger members of the University community, the department publishes and distributes bulletins and e-mail notifications.

The purpose of these notices is to alert the community to serious events so that they may take appropriate precautions.”

This policy statement is vague in that it does not describe the types of events or incidents that warrant such a warning.

The University also failed to maintain an accurate and complete crime log in accordance with the Federal regulations. The crime log entries are reviewed and coded by University officials and placed into a database to generate reports. The review team acquired and reviewed a copy of the approximately 174 log entries for the review period and determined that incidents were underreported and required information not included. For example, in the crime log, only one incident lists the disposition of the case. Approximately 173 criminal offenses (not including the arrests and disciplinary referrals for liquor, drug, and weapons offenses) were included in the institution's Campus Security Reports during 2001, 2002, and 2003. The University was required to include log entries for all criminal incidents, arrests and referral cases. The University is located in an area with a relatively high crime rate however; the majority of logged incidents were in the theft category. A smaller number of assaults, burglaries, and sex offenses were also included. As a result of La Salle's internal audit during the Summer of 2004, a total of 65 burglaries were disclosed in the 2004 Campus Security Report. However, during each of the years under review, only 20 burglaries are listed and no adjustments or clarifying entries were made to the crime log. The Department believes these reported figures are inaccurate.

It is essential that the University provide these warnings frequently and in a systematic manner to provide the most accurate and complete consumer information possible in the interest of the safety and well being of the campus community.

REFERENCE:

Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crimes Statistics Act,
20 USC § 1092 (f), as amended,
Section 485 (f), Higher Education Act, as amended
34 CFR § 668.46 (b)(i), (e), and (f), General Provision-Regulations

REQUIREMENT:

For crime prevention purposes [34 CFR §668.46(e)], participating institutions must timely report to the campus community warnings on the following crimes:

- Homicide, Sex offenses, Robbery, Aggravated Assault, Burglary, Motor Vehicle Theft, Arson, Arrests for Liquor and Drug Law Violations, and Arrests for Illegal Weapons Possession;
- Reported Hate Crimes;

- Other Crimes Reported to Campus Security Authorities Under the Institution's Policy;
and
- Crimes Considered as a Threat to Students and Employees.

The Act also requires that the University's policies and procedures be published in the Campus Security Report and include policies for issuing these timely warnings. It is essential that the University provide these timely warnings as frequently and systematically as needed to provide the most accurate and complete consumer information possible in the interest of the safety and well being of the campus community.

Additionally, participating institutions must maintain "a written, easily understood daily crime log" listing all crimes, by the date it was reported, that occurred 1) on campus; 2) on a non-campus building or property; 3) on public property; or 4) within the campus police or security department's patrol area that it becomes aware of or is reported to it [34 CFR § 668.46 (f)]. This reporting requirement applies to all categories of crime not merely those crimes listed in 34 CFR §668.46 (c)(1) and (3). The log must include the nature, date, time, general location, and disposition of each offense. Therefore, the University must establish policies and procedures to ensure that the crime log is updated in an accurate and complete manner and available for review upon request.

In response to this finding, the University must provide copies of all warnings that were issued to students and employees regarding any of the on-campus incidents disclosed in the University's 2004 Campus Security Report. The Department will conduct a thorough review of timely warnings and of the crime log.

In our Final Program Review Determination letter, this office will advise the University of actions that may be required as a result of this violation.

FINDING # 4: REQUIRED POLICY STATEMENTS OMITTED OR INCOMPLETE

La Salle failed to include certain required policy statements in its Campus Security Reports which are intended to enable students and parents to make informed decisions and to be aware of available resources and recourse in the event of certain crimes. Specifically, the Policy did not contain the disclosure regarding procedures for campus disciplinary action in alleged sexual assault cases.

The review team noted specific policy deficiencies including the lack of a required notification to students advising them of all of the rights and protections provided under the Clery provisions referred to as the Campus Sexual Assault Victims Bill of Rights (CSAVBR) as set forth in §485(f)(8) of the HEA and 34 C.F.R. 668.46(b)(11). For example, the University's Campus Security Report does not include a clear statement that institutional personnel will assist the student in notifying appropriate law enforcement authorities in the event of certain crimes. Even though in a separate section, the Report does reference that security officers will provide various assistance, the law requires this disclosure as part of the CSAVBR to emphasize the importance

of timely and meaningful assistance in sexual assault cases. Therefore, this policy statement does not provide the type of actual notice contemplated by 34 CFR §668.46 (b)(11)(iii).

We also note that the Campus Security Report did not include a policy statement detailing how crime statistics were compiled for the years under review. Additionally, the reports lacked any policy discussion of any confidential incident reporting schemes or the institution's position regarding voluntary statistics-only reporting by professional or pastoral counselors as required by 34 CFR §668.46(b)(4)(iii). Finally, the Campus Security Report does not describe alcohol and drug-abuse education programs offered in compliance with the HEA under section 120 (a) and (b).

REFERENCE:

Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act,
20 USC § 1092(f), as amended,
Section 485 (f), Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended
20 U.S.C. §1011i, Section of 120 of the Higher Education Act, as amended
34 CFR § 668.46 (b)(11) and (b)(4)(iii), General Provision Regulations

REQUIREMENT:

Federal regulations at 34 CFR §668.46 (b) (2) through (11) require that institutions include policy statements in their Campus Security Reports. These disclosures are intended to more fully inform the campus community about the institution's security policies and programs. In general, the institution's policy and procedures must include:

- The law enforcement authority and practices of the institution's police or security force;
- Reporting procedures for students and employees, and policies that governs the preparation of the incident report itself;
- Disclosure of alcohol and drug policies and educational programs;
- Disclosure of policies pertaining to sexual assault education, prevention and adjudication; and
- Notice to students that victims of sexual assault may change their academic or living arrangements.

In our Final Program Review Determination letter, this office will advise the University of actions that may be required as a result of this violation.

D. REQUIRED ACTIONS

The University must address the findings identified in this program review report. This can include challenging our findings and/or offering additional information. The University must conduct an institutional self-study of its Clery Act compliance in previous years. The University's response is due within 75 days from the receipt of this program review report.

The University must conduct a comprehensive review of its campus security policies and procedures with specific attention to the coding of incidents, the collection and compilation of data, and the production of the annual Campus Security Report. Then, the University must prepare a detailed report of its findings.

- This assessment must describe the method by which the 2003 Campus Security Report was produced and distributed. Secondly, the assessment must specify what changes, if any, were implemented with regard to the compilation of statistics for and production of the 2004 and 2005 Campus Security Reports respectively.
- The report must detail any relevant personnel, policy and procedural changes implemented subsequent to the 2005 Campus Security Report or any proposed changes that may affect the compilation of statistics or the production of future reports. Please be as precise in your descriptions and explanations as possible.
- The following items should guide your responses:
 - a. What was the stated policy in place at the time;
 - b. What actions/inactions were actually carried out notwithstanding that policy, based on the current examination;
 - c. Who was responsible for carrying out the function, and who was responsible for supervising that function (please do not include employee's names, use positions only);
 - d. Why did the violation or weakness occur;
 - e. What procedural changes were/will be made to ensure that this violation did/does not recur;
 - f. What specific policy changes were/will be made to address this condition; and
 - g. Who will be responsible for carrying out these new policies and procedures?

Adequate responses must be given with regard to each finding as well as any additional violations or weaknesses that are identified in your comprehensive review.

Since June 2004, we do note that the University has already implemented some corrective actions to improve these deficiencies, as follows:

- Commissioned for an internal investigation and campus security audit to identify its weaknesses.
- Improved lighting for walkways and parking lots was added;
- Installed additional security cameras and surveillance equipment;
- Utilized contract security patrols to assist the campus force; and
- Established a plan to offer new training programs in a number of mission-critical areas to include report writing.

In the Final Program Review Determination letter, this office will advise the University of any additional actions it must take to close the program review. Additionally, we will notify the University of any other actions that will be required as a result of the non-compliance identified in this report.

A copy of all documents and/or records produced to respond to this report must be submitted as part of the University's response to this program review report. Any exceptions must be discussed with the review team.

As part of the Final Program Review Determination letter, the University will be required to prepare and distribute a supplemental Campus Security Report disclosing revised policies and statistics for calendar years 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004.

PART ONE OFFENSES
35TH DISTRICT "I" AND "M" SECTORS
14TH DISTRICT "F" AND "Z" SECTORS
2001, 2002, 2003

35TH DISTRICT	2001		
CLASSIFICATION	I	M	TOTAL
MURDER	2	0	2
RAPE	16	0	12
ROBBERY	150	19	69
AGG/ASSAULT	272	63	100
BURGLARY	61	52	108
THEFT	205	108	311
VEHICLE THEFT	96	62	157
TOTAL	498	323	821

14TH DISTRICT	2001		
CLASSIFICATION	F	Z	TOTAL
MURDER	0	0	4
RAPE	2	0	3
ROBBERY	10	10	32
AGG/ASSAULT	12	25	57
BURGLARY	20	28	48
THEFT	60	35	85
VEHICLE THEFT	28	22	48
TOTAL	151	120	271

35TH DISTRICT	2002		
CLASSIFICATION	I	M	TOTAL
MURDER	2	0	2
RAPE	10	0	10
ROBBERY	151	21	78
AGG/ASSAULT	157	49	93
BURGLARY	38	69	107
THEFT	132	136	273
VEHICLE THEFT	87	61	138
TOTAL	362	349	711

14TH DISTRICT	2002		
CLASSIFICATION	F	Z	TOTAL
MURDER	0	0	0
RAPE	10	0	4
ROBBERY	12	10	34
AGG/ASSAULT	27	19	46
BURGLARY	28	26	54
THEFT	42	43	85
VEHICLE THEFT	24	25	49
TOTAL	144	123	267

35TH DISTRICT	2003		
CLASSIFICATION	I	M	TOTAL
MURDER	2	0	4
RAPE	14	0	13
ROBBERY	157	34	111
AGG/ASSAULT	161	42	85
BURGLARY	40	59	99
THEFT	134	97	228
VEHICLE THEFT	79	52	131
TOTAL	357	301	658

14TH DISTRICT	2003		
CLASSIFICATION	F	Z	TOTAL
MURDER	0	0	2
RAPE	10	0	10
ROBBERY	12	10	31
AGG/ASSAULT	22	17	39
BURGLARY	21	23	44
THEFT	49	35	84
VEHICLE THEFT	12	16	28
TOTAL	130	108	238

APPENDIX A

La Salle University Campus Security
Program Review
Philadelphia Police Department
14th and 35th Police District
Statistics

RESEARCH & PLANNING UNIT
STATISTICAL SECTION
12/16/2004

PART ONE OFFENSES

35TH DISTRICT

2001, 2002, 2003

35TH DISTRICT		2001																		
CLASSIFICATION	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	TOTAL
MURDER	1	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	12
RAPE	5	8	3	4	3	6	2	10	1	0	2	0	1	2	1	2	7	4	8	82
ROBBERY	80	92	18	83	74	58	30	73	56	51	42	8	19	2	9	10	81	32	50	800
AGG/ ASSAULT	81	52	18	57	58	42	64	89	37	36	50	1	63	8	3	11	54	37	63	778
BURGLARY	68	89	28	54	60	108	31	42	81	47	26	8	37	5	3	9	85	25	42	813
THEFT	147	318	83	156	182	178	114	137	205	130	80	18	108	14	5	34	118	87	171	2278
VEHICLE THEFT	120	151	78	75	123	87	38	82	66	40	47	5	71	1	13	16	98	81	84	1282
TOTAL	583	875	263	407	506	583	363	527	623	416	272	32	423	37	37	82	465	325	425	6023

35TH DISTRICT		2002																		
CLASSIFICATION	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	TOTAL
MURDER	2	2	0	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	18
RAPE	6	8	0	3	8	6	5	8	5	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	2	71
ROBBERY	51	89	27	57	71	44	32	45	46	47	18	0	27	0	0	0	48	28	40	653
AGG/ ASSAULT	53	58	21	48	53	30	49	40	45	39	36	0	48	0	0	0	52	38	64	645
BURGLARY	53	96	27	42	82	60	33	45	38	34	39	0	69	0	0	0	72	27	48	735
THEFT	121	262	77	129	148	154	81	86	137	118	79	0	136	0	0	0	123	89	149	1856
VEHICLE THEFT	117	129	66	87	113	78	41	43	77	49	41	0	61	0	0	0	87	40	80	1088
TOTAL	502	875	263	407	506	583	363	527	623	416	272	32	423	37	37	82	465	325	425	6023

35TH DISTRICT		2003																		
CLASSIFICATION	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	TOTAL
MURDER	4	6	2	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	3	31
RAPE	6	4	3	9	7	4	2	0	0	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	10	4	7	90
ROBBERY	53	94	26	81	60	35	31	50	57	40	28	0	45	0	0	0	38	19	46	691
AGG/ ASSAULT	39	65	14	47	58	20	45	65	41	33	51	0	41	0	0	0	37	34	52	626
BURGLARY	39	79	21	33	57	57	20	34	40	27	38	0	38	0	0	0	30	33	33	598
THEFT	110	234	80	99	173	128	89	70	135	120	79	0	187	0	0	0	87	53	120	1878
VEHICLE THEFT	117	133	69	73	107	79	31	41	75	38	37	0	61	0	0	0	70	33	51	1090
TOTAL	408	655	209	322	522	422	285	270	373	353	231	42	304	20	30	10	205	177	342	5714

*Sectors L,N,O AND P were taken over by another district in March of 2001

APPENDIX A

La Salle University Campus Security
Program Review
Philadelphia Police Department
14th and 35th Police District
Statistics

RESEARCH & PLANNING UNIT
STATISTICAL SECTION
12/16/2004

La Salle University Campus Security
Program Review
Philadelphia Police Department
14th and 35th Police District
Statistics

14TH DISTRICT														2001																				TOTAL		
CLASSIFICATION	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	1	2	3	TOTAL							
MURDER	2	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	21						
RAPE	3	4	0	-1	4	0	1	4	3	1	6	3	2	4	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	6	6	1	0	0	71							
ROBBERY	32	18	34	38	43	0	28	29	21	11	30	18	15	20	18	18	78	35	15	4	10	5	4	20	30	7	0	6	609							
AGG. ASSAULT	34	24	22	10	31	0	18	27	14	11	42	37	16	22	5	14	63	18	18	0	3	0	43	42	10	0	4	588								
BURGLARY	25	32	36	26	63	30	18	84	32	38	88	21	58	62	35	40	26	20	8	24	18	14	87	37	5	1	18	918								
THEFT	97	43	85	180	105	71	81	97	78	122	135	51	118	107	98	163	87	45	29	72	30	32	108	128	49	17	69	2312								
VEHICLE THEFT	55	23	34	12	32	31	24	33	68	20	34	86	21	72	47	70	86	80	42	8	80	12	8	66	41	38	2	14	1190							
TOTAL	230	143	262	245	270	161	188	182	264	304	271	227	107	293	238	237	431	216	138	47	180	17	92	286	126	111	28	100	5633							

14TH DISTRICT		2002																												
CLASSIFICATION	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y		1	2	3	
MURDER	0	1	0	1	1		0	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		0	0	0	16
RAPE	3	2	2	3	7		0	1	0	0	7	5	4	5	3	1	4	1	0	2	0	1	0	10	2		1	0	0	69
ROBBERY	26	18	30	29	31		20	27	18	4	31	15	6	34	18	23	53	18	10	2	8	4	22	27		3	1	12	536	
AGG ASSAULT	21	22	38	12	34		18	34	18	16	31	13	16	28	1	0	38	13	14	3	0	1	1	36	20		10	1	6	907
BURGLARY	42	37	37	26	37		30	29	69	28	39	72	19	83	68	49	44	21	18	5	48	15	11	60	27		18	2	22	963
THEFT	97	41	96	124	102		75	81	89	34	93	105	25	108	120	99	136	81	44	9	89	31	35	96	100		96	10	35	2896
VEHICLE THEFT	37	32	92	27	45		26	17	48	20	49	80	15	40	37	45	87	42	29	6	42	3	0	36	30		14	1	9	900
TOTAL	234	181	282	221	257		147	170	191	140	104	249	283	56	271	244	216	348	117	118	187	90	260	215	128		102	15	84	9933

14TH DISTRICT						2003																												
CLASSIFICATION	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	TOTAL				
MURDER	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18			
RAPE	4	3	3	2	5	0	4	3	1	2	2	1	3	1	0	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	1	0	0	68				
ROBBERY	40	13	46	30	37	103	35	30	18	11	35	20	42	33	19	15	64	12	20	3	11	8	64	29	0	8	1	2	0	610				
AGG ASSAULT	28	14	63	14	38	202	16	30	15	23	34	11	21	22	4	9	39	12	13	0	3	0	0	42	29	0	4	0	3	598				
BURGLARY	25	29	34	27	24	20	25	18	44	18	31	27	25	38	32	27	38	20	12	12	28	9	66	30	0	13	2	8	757					
THEFT	105	31	91	114	90	149	80	86	103	61	88	93	23	131	100	88	185	66	63	18	98	32	31	90	77	0	46	5	38	2352				
VEHICLE THEFT	62	20	46	36	30	132	18	15	55	34	40	103	19	71	72	81	85	40	25	6	42	3	4	68	36	0	32	0	8	1070				
TOTAL	280	112	295	224	263	130	178	152	236	141	228	256	113	318	223	201	383	139	127	37	51	51	50	262	203	108	104	6	69	5030				

RESEARCH & PLANNING UNIT
STATISTICAL SECTION
12/16/2004

OTHER SEXUAL OFFENSES
35TH DISTRICT "I" AND "M" SECTORS
14TH DISTRICT "F" AND "Z" SECTORS
2001, 2002, 2003

35TH DISTRICT	2001		
CLASSIFICATION	F	M	TOTAL
INCEST	0	0	0
INDECENT ASSAULT	2	2	4
CORRUPTING MINORS	0	0	0
IDS(MALE COMPLAINANT)	1	3	4
IDS(FEMALE COMPLAINANT)	0	0	0
PUBLIC INDECENCY	5	4	9
STATUTORY SEXUAL ASSAULT	1	0	1
OPEN LEWDNESS	0	0	0
AGG/INDECENT ASSAULT	0	0	0
LURING CHILD	0	0	0
SEXUAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN	0	0	0
TOTAL	9	9	18

14TH DISTRICT	2001		
CLASSIFICATION	F	Z	TOTAL
INCEST	0	0	0
INDECENT ASSAULT	0	1	1
CORRUPTING MINORS	0	0	0
IDS(MALE COMPLAINANT)	0	0	0
IDS(FEMALE COMPLAINANT)	0	0	0
PUBLIC INDECENCY	0	1	1
STATUTORY SEXUAL ASSAULT	0	1	1
OPEN LEWDNESS	0	0	0
AGG/INDECENT ASSAULT	0	0	0
LURING CHILD	1	0	1
SEXUAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN	0	0	0
TOTAL	1	3	4

35TH DISTRICT	2002		
CLASSIFICATION	F	M	TOTAL
INCEST	0	0	0
INDECENT ASSAULT	0	1	1
CORRUPTING MINORS	1	0	1
IDS(MALE COMPLAINANT)	0	1	1
IDS(FEMALE COMPLAINANT)	2	2	4
PUBLIC INDECENCY	3	0	3
STATUTORY SEXUAL ASSAULT	2	2	4
OPEN LEWDNESS	0	0	0
AGG/INDECENT ASSAULT	0	0	0
LURING CHILD	0	0	0
SEXUAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN	0	0	0
TOTAL	15	6	21

14TH DISTRICT	2002		
CLASSIFICATION	F	Z	TOTAL
INCEST	0	0	0
INDECENT ASSAULT	2	0	2
CORRUPTING MINORS	0	0	0
IDS(MALE COMPLAINANT)	0	0	0
IDS(FEMALE COMPLAINANT)	0	1	1
PUBLIC INDECENCY	0	0	0
STATUTORY SEXUAL ASSAULT	0	1	1
OPEN LEWDNESS	0	0	0
AGG/INDECENT ASSAULT	1	1	2
LURING CHILD	0	0	0
SEXUAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN	0	0	0
TOTAL	3	3	6

35TH DISTRICT	2003		
CLASSIFICATION	F	M	TOTAL
INCEST	0	0	0
INDECENT ASSAULT	0	5	5
CORRUPTING MINORS	0	0	0
IDS(MALE COMPLAINANT)	0	0	0
IDS(FEMALE COMPLAINANT)	0	1	1
PUBLIC INDECENCY	0	0	0
STATUTORY SEXUAL ASSAULT	0	0	0
OPEN LEWDNESS	0	0	0
AGG/INDECENT ASSAULT	0	1	1
LURING CHILD	0	0	0
SEXUAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	7	7

14TH DISTRICT	2003		
CLASSIFICATION	F	Z	TOTAL
INCEST	0	0	0
INDECENT ASSAULT	0	4	4
CORRUPTING MINORS	0	0	0
IDS(MALE COMPLAINANT)	0	0	0
IDS(FEMALE COMPLAINANT)	1	1	2
PUBLIC INDECENCY	2	1	3
STATUTORY SEXUAL ASSAULT	1	0	1
OPEN LEWDNESS	0	0	0
AGG/INDECENT ASSAULT	0	0	0
LURING CHILD	1	1	2
SEXUAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN	0	0	0
TOTAL	5	7	12

APPENDIX A

La Salle University Campus Security
Program Review
Philadelphia Police Department
14th and 35th Police District
Statistics

APPENDIX B

La Salle University Campus Security
Program Review
Community Development/Student
Affairs

FIVE YEAR SUMMARY OF DISCIPLINARY CASES

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Summary of Disciplinary Cases					
Total Number of Full Time Students	3314	3136	3116	3150	2919
Total Number of Resident Students	2056	2035	2062	1963	1860
Total Number of Cases	862 (1)	1001 (2)	830 (3)	751 (4)	813 (5)
Resident Students	813	918	766	693	770
Commuter Students	49	83	64	58	43
Responsible	683	778	727	670	663
Charges Dropped/Not Responsible	166	199	89	72	88
Open Cases	11	15	9	7	52
Open Cases (No longer enrolled)	2	9	5	2	10
Conduct Warning	296	401	354	335	394
Specific Probation	329	345	332	304	233
General Probation	52	29	34	23	31
Suspension from the University	5	3	5	6	5
Dismissal	1	0	2	2	
Alcohol Violations	494	583	407	439	499
Interim Suspension of Housing	5	7	9	6	8
Interim Suspension from the University	3	4	5	6	
Suspension of Housing	32	23	22	41	31
Judicial Board Hearings	24	27	18	28	34
Administrative Hearings	9	12	8	17	9

(1) 59 of these cases involved more than one incident. The total number of incidents was 929.

(2) 68 of these cases involved more than one incident. The total number of incidents was 1096.

(3) 50 of these cases involved more than one incident. The total number of incidents was 909.

(4) 42 of these cases involved more than one incident. The total number of incidents was 827.

(5) 74 of these cases involved more than one incident. The total number of incidents was 972.